too small for the stone. Some of the accepted functions of terra cotta can now be performed by moulded bricks, in forms a little larger than the wall bricks, for bands of ornament and mouldings, or as individual units of ornamental panels, through which the wall joints run, insuring a complete unity of color, texture and scale with the other parts of the wall.

In the combination of its simple, honest qualities, brickwork serves the cause of virtue as it brings to the builder the assurance of a sturdy resistance as compared to the shapeless forms of dough-like materials—such as concrete and stucco. There is less temptation and no less danger, of falling into the eccentric and the Art Nouveau when using well laid bricks. Many sins, of course, have been committed in the use of all materials. But brick can be said to be a reasonably safe material to start with.

Brick calls for strong and idiomatic handling, and the present generation of designers has but just commenced to enter upon its study. While very many edifying examples of detail are well known to exist, only a very few good buildings composed completely of brick and terra cotta could have been found in our cities before the present time; even now their number is small, for good design adapted to a newly used material develops but slowly.

The use of pattern, jointing and bond which can be successfully accomplished by any and all kinds of brick work, however, is found to interest and educate the people in brick construction and, therefore, it should greatly increase the use of brick in future. No manufacturer, whether he makes a pressed brick, wire-cut brick, rough texture or common brick, can fail to share in the coming benefit. The wooden house must inevitably go. Already it has been fully demonstrated by actual and reliable figures that the cost of the average sized house in brick is only five per cent. to six per cent. more than the same house built of wood.

The use of brick in architecture presents to us a rapidly developing field of endeavor which is bound to grow as people come to realize more and more its advantages and common sense adaptability.

Finally, it makes very little difference just what we do in architecture, but it makes all the difference in the world how we do it. With good bricks and good bricklayers available, the architects of to-day can surely be counted on to do their best in finding a way of producing an indigenous brick architecture which will become one of the most important branches of our great architectural scheme that is being developed and perfected in this broad land of ours.

LACK OF PRACTICAL KNOWLEDGE AMONG ARCHITECTS

An editorial article in the Revue Générale de la Construction by M. Jaaras demonstrates the general need of reinforced concrete construction knowledge by architects

NICE AND NANCY have been the scene of serious accidents, caused by the collapse of reinforced concrete structure, and these accidents, which have resulted in several deaths, should point a definite moral.

Heretofore, reinforced concrete construction has remained in the domain of the engineer. The architect who wishes to execute a design calling for this form of construction, arranges with a concern that takes charge of all the preliminary calculation, as well as of the execution of the work.

The importance of reinforced concrete construction has led the large builders to secure sub-contractors in all the important centres—each sub-contractor following the general methods of the larger concern, but, except in the case of very important contracts, undertaking, at their own risk and danger, the completion of the work that has been entrusted to them.

The result of this form of industrial combination is that when an accident happens, it is almost impossible to incriminate the method employed, since, in the majority of cases, it would be easy to show that the same method, followed under other conditions, would have given excellent results, without accidents, when not only were the calculations made with precision and exactness, but also—and especially—when the work had been carefully followed by those who accepted the responsibility of its execution.

In the Nice and Nancy accidents, it is necessary to choose between two conclusions—either the calculations were defective, providing beams that were too weak to carry the weight that they would have to support; or the calculations were correct and the proportions right, and it was the execution that was defective, or the inspection deficient.

The judicial investigation will no doubt decide which of these two hypotheses is correct. But without prejudicing the outcome of the inquest, there is very good reason to believe that the second hypothesis will be found to be the correct one, because it would be very surprising if men, accustomed to this kind of mathematical problems—specialists trained by the competent heads of the firms, conscientious and loyal—could have made the grave errors necessary to produce such a terrible catastrophe.

If, as we believe, it is the second cause that has produced the disaster, the responsibility of the heads of the undertaking is none the less evident, but the question of their competence can be taken out of the discussion, and it is surely a great point for French science to be freed from the suspicion of incompetence.

However, in a work of this kind, there are three heads on which the heavy responsibility of the work must rest. There is first the architect who designs the plan—the only one of whom we wished to speak here—and who, if his education were complete, ought to be able to carry out the plan in its entirety, to examine its minutest details, and to be certain that at completion the structure will be what he had aimed at.

His role should not consist merely of designing a structure and of hastening to a contractor to have the calculations of this structure made. He ought